



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Sichumovi and Hano I do not know, but the populations of these two towns are so small that a slight increase or decrease on one side would result in upsetting the proportions very considerably.

I do not consider these facts to have disposed of this question by any means. If we could have a clan census from every other pueblo it is likely that a very different condition of affairs would be disclosed. Yet, admitting the whole question to be provisional, I feel as much justified in accepting Hopi tradition as embodying a true kernel of fact as Professor Kroeber in rejecting it because clans are qualitatively present throughout the Pueblo area. All of this shows that we need much more information from the remaining pueblos, and more studies of the kind here under consideration.

JOHN R. SWANTON.

Zuñi Kin and Clan. A. L. KROEBER. (Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, vol. XVIII, pt. II, pp. 39-204, 3 text figures and 9 maps.) New York, 1917.

Dr. Kroeber in his admirable monograph on "Zuñi Kin and Clan" throws down the gauntlet to the partisans of the theory of the clan as the basis of society. The challenge at large is no doubt called for, and to Dr. Kroeber's appreciation of the importance of the blood kin compared with the clan and of the subordination of clan to tribe I take no exception; nevertheless I incline to think that Dr. Kroeber has misinterpreted or undervalued in theory, even on his own scrupulous array of data, the position of the clan in Zuñi. He has carried through this theoretical undervaluation along three lines, first by separating too rigidly the ceremonial functions in Zuñi culture from what he calls social functions, and limiting clan participation to the former; second, by overlooking, in comparison with his otherwise careful research, a number of economic as well as of ceremonial facts which may have considerable significance in clanship analysis; third, by leaving out of consideration the more or less conscious attitude of the Zuñi themselves towards clanship. That a woman should be reprimanded by her husband for having spoken bitterly of a clansman, reprimanded merely because the man was her clansman, an incident once described to me, may be potentially as significant a fact as the fact of one national criticizing another for abusing a fellow countryman. Given such a sense either of nationality or of clanship it can hardly be said that "the clan [or the nation] is not thought of in ordinary personal relations of man to man, or of man to woman" (I fail to see how the fact of clan exogamy does

not enter daily into the personal relationships of man to woman), and only by taking into account the psychology of the clan sense of solidarity could such extraordinary facts as migration by clan be understood. Would Dr. Kroeber say that he observed at Zuñi no expressions of clan solidarity sufficient to account for any such migration by households unrelated by blood as are reputed to have occurred for example from Zuñi to the Hopi or from Laguna to Isleta? I realize that it has still to be proved that such households were unrelated by blood or even that clanship was a selective principle among the immigrants.

Zuñi clans play an important part, as Dr. Kroeber admits, in Zuñi ceremonialism, but if ceremonialism is itself, as it undeniably is at Zuñi, an essential of both public and private economy, how can it be said that clanship is "only an ornamental excrescence upon Zuñi society"? To say that without the clans the forms of Zuñi religion will have to be made over in part, "but the life and work of day to day, the contact of person with person, will go on unaltered," is to the student of Zuñi ceremonialism much like saying that however men express thought or feeling, they breathe and digest, they are born and they die.

A more persuasive content would have attached to Dr. Kroeber's thesis in regard to the clanlessness of daily life had he shown in a number of families or even in his one pedigreed family the amount of family intercourse and cooperation which occurs, to what extent related households work together in agriculture—in planting, in harvesting and in threshing, in sheep-raising and dipping, what relations cut feather-sticks for others, or have attended at childbirth or at death or burial, or what relatives have adopted children or given a roof to the discontented at home. All of these economic or ceremonial activities he would have found performed, I have no doubt, by kin and not by clan, but he would have had to consider whether, kin lacking, any of them would have been undertaken by clan. The preparation of a corpse and its burial are undertaken by the paternal kin, but supposing paternal kin are lacking, would not the paternal clanswomen and men of the deceased render the requisite offices rather than his maternal kin or his own children?

And is Dr. Kroeber certain that in planting feather-sticks certain *koko* or gods are not viewed as clan ancestors, or that in the building or repair of the *shalako* houses, in supplying them with wood, and in the field work of the *shalako* hosts, clanspeople of the hosts or impersonators in the ceremonial, mere clanspeople, do not help? In the repair of the house of the ranking priesthood Stevenson states explicitly (*The Zuñi Indians*, p. 227) that the work was done by the clanspeople of the priests,

the workmen appointed by the *pekwin* or sun priest, a member of the same clan as the aforesaid priests. The names of the appointees were called out by one of the *tenientes* or council. Clearly here was a case of communal labor by clan, ceremonial, if you like, as well as economic; but it may well be a ceremonial survival of an early provision of merely economic clan labor.

"Clan and kin are distinct things, one rather lightly superimposed upon the other," concludes Dr. Kroeber. We would run less risk of the very schematization Dr. Kroeber criticizes elsewhere, it seems to me, were we to figure the relation between kin and clan as a circle with the kin at the center and the clan at the circumference, letting the radii represent the functions, ceremonial or "social." When these functions can be performed by a few persons the kin, as long as kin are available, are called upon; but when the kin are unavailable or when the services of a comparatively large number are desired clanspeople or the clan as a whole are called upon. Take the clan relation towards the *koyemshi*. The final day of the *shalako* ceremonial the head of each *koyemshi* has to be washed and his back loaded with presents. Members of his father's clan nearest to him in blood perform these functions. But all his father's clansmen have cut feather-sticks for him and male and female representatives from the households of his father's clan march into the plaza bringing him gifts of meal or bread, of melons, of mutton and store-bought goods. Here is one occasion at least, Dr. Kroeber to the contrary, where the clan does act as a whole.

To ensure the clan gifts to the *koyemshi* messengers have gone from house to house. These messengers belong to the household of the *koyemshi's* father's sister, his *kuku* par excellence, I think, I am not sure. The alternative is that the messengers belong to a household having particular clan authority or leadership. Dr. Kroeber would summarily dismiss this alternative with the statement that there are no clan heads. I have heard too many references to the selection of ceremonial impersonators by clan heads to be satisfied with Dr. Kroeber's conclusion in general on this point without further investigation. Indeed the whole subject of the selection of persons for ceremonial rôles belonging to or associated with clans needs the most careful study. Take the present confusion of our knowledge about the impersonation of *pautiwa*, *koko awan mosi*, the gods their director. Stevenson states that *pautiwa* is chosen by the Corn clan and the children of the Corn clan (persons whose fathers are Corn clansmen) assembled in the house of the head of the clan. Dr. Kroeber states that *pautiwa* must be a Dogwood clans-

man and selection by the clan as a body he disputes as unparalleled in Zuñi practice. According to my informants *pautiwa itiwonna* (*pautiwa* of the winter solstice ceremonial) must be a Dogwood although the two men of whom one or the other now habitually impersonates *pautiwa* were sons of a Turkey clansman who in his day impersonated *pautiwa* and who *handed the position down to his sons*. This Turkey clansman was, however, child of the Dogwood. Unfortunately my notes leave a doubt as to whether the present impersonators are Dogwood. If they are their fathers must have taken the rather unusual step of marrying into his father's clan. In spite of these facts my informants stated that the impersonator of *pautiwa* would be selected by the *pichikwe amosi*, the directors or heads of the Dogwood people.—But *pautiwa itiwonna* is not the only impersonation of *pautiwa*, there is *pautiwa molawia* (the impersonation in the *molawia* ceremony at the close of *shalako*). The impersonator of *pautiwa molawia* is or should be a Tobacco clansman selected by the heads of the Tansy-mustard clan, by the same "heads," I surmise, who choose the girls who run in the *molawia*.—Rather complicated!

Another point in regard to clan heads. Is it not possible that the clan *ettowe* or fetiches listed by Dr. Kroeber convey a certain distinction or headship to the families in charge of them if merely in accordance with the conceptual schematization Dr. Kroeber points out so well as characteristic of the Zuñi? The argument that the possession of *ettowe* by the clans, however, is evidence "that the Zuñi clan is much more a part of a ritualistic scheme than a body of kindred" is to my mind not valid, for may not the *ettone* be merely a pattern which is associated with group formation, with the formation of any group? Incidentally I would suggest that the *ettone* is property, quite as much property as the "good will" of an American business or the saint's image in a Catholic church (I surmise that the Zuñi think of their *santu* as an *ettone*. As for the canes of the *tenientes* I venture to say that they too are approximations of *ettowe*), and in so far as the clans are possessed of *ettowe* it can hardly be said that there is nothing "that can be considered clan property."

It is from lack of data that Dr. Kroeber disregards the possible significance of the clan *ettowe*. His disregard of the question of leadership among the clans is more wilful. In view of the fact that the ranking priests of Zuñi must belong to the Dogwood clan (likewise as I have said, the personator of the ranking figure among the *koko* or *kachina*), it is difficult not to recognize a degree of clan supremacy and not merely

clan equivalence at present in Zuñi or in view of the clan autocracy at Acoma, for example, not to speculate as to a still greater degree of clan preponderance at Zuñi in the past. Take the matter of communal service for the ranking priesthood. In Acoma four sacred rabbit hunts are held yearly and the game given to the paramount priest; his land is also planted for him by the people and it is he or his "uncles" or "brothers" who assign farm lands to the people. Nowadays in Zuñi only one sacred rabbit hunt is held every four years (the game goes to the ranking priesthood) and there is neither planting of priest-owned fields by the people nor land allotment by the priests, but may not the priestly prerogatives and the priestly control have once been larger—before Spanish interference? At least the question needs investigation.¹

Most painstaking and accurate are Dr. Kroeber's data in kinship terminology but here again because of his clan prejudice his comment or inference is sometimes open to question. Is not the Zuñi indifferent to fine discriminations of consanguinity and unsistent upon carrying relationship back very far not because he is merely linguistically contradictory or merely uninterested in genealogy but because of his clan consciousness? It is just as you might answer when asked of one John Smith, a seventh or eleventh cousin, "Oh I don't know exactly how he is related, but he is one of that Smith family." Given the closed circle of clanship, fine distinctions are not urgent, only gross distinctions, such as my own mother, my own father, my blood relatives, are in order.

Towards the evidence kinship terminology may have for relationships not found today at Zuñi it seems to me that Dr. Kroeber is somewhat impatient. The similarity of terms for a woman's brother's son and for son-in-law, is, as Dr. Kroeber says, a striking argument for cross-cousin marriage nor is Dr. Kroeber's preferred explanation incompatible, as far as I can see, with the argument. Cross-cousin marriage certainly does not exist today in Zuñi nor does marriage with a deceased brother's wife and yet I would not close the case for cross-cousin marriage in the past or, if the Zuñi call a father's brother's wife *inniha*, stepmother (that so careful an observer as Dr. Kroeber did not get this application of the stepmother term *inniha* would make me doubt

¹ Judging from a recent land dispute, sacerdotal land control would not seem foreign even today to the Zuñi point of view. Kwanton, an ex-governor, holds a Spanish deed to land to which in 1916, if not before, he was setting up a claim. The *tenientes* refused to consider the claim, the lieutenant-governor throwing down his cane in the plaza in the course of the quarrel. As a result of this controversy as well as of other matters in dispute—the *tenientes* were changed by the ranking priests and Kwanton's party, as we would say, recognized.

the accuracy of my informants except that Dr. Kroeber himself found some puzzling applications of the term), for the levirate merely because the Zuñi themselves repudiate and scorn the idea of the practices. The Zuñi are not only thorough believers, as Dr. Kroeber has pointed out, that whatever is, is right, but that whatever is not, is wrong. In suspending conclusions on early marriage customs, I might even wonder what Zuñi women mean when they refer to *shalako* night as a time "for stealing a word with our other husbands" were I not afraid of being derided by Dr. Kroeber as one fascinated by the theory of promiscuity.

Nevertheless I have courage enough to hold that "the marked tendency towards descent from father to son in the priesthood" is of interest—both psychologically and historically. Dr. Kroeber suggests an interesting psychological basis for the clan, namely that a woman is *felt* to be a very different thing from a man in relationship. Would he not be willing to entertain the hypothesis that paternal descent becomes a principle in ceremonialism because a man is felt to be a very different thing from a woman in religion? From the historical standpoint, that patrilinear kinship tends to be associated with Zuñi ceremonialism may not be an unimportant fact at all. Suppose, for example, that it becomes established that part of the complexity of Zuñi ceremonialism is due to the incorporation of Catholic rituals, would not the presence of the principle of paternal descent in a ceremonial be at least one clue as to whether in other particulars Spanish acculturation was to be looked for?

As a parting shot on the interpretation of Zuñi clanship let me ask Dr. Kroeber why if it is true that to the native mind the clan is "essentially a schematic subdivision, and perhaps a more or less artificial one, of the community as a whole," why if it is true that the clan is "a ceremonial rather than a socially functioning body" (a misleading distinction as I have said before), then why are the Zuñi so conspicuously ready to talk, as Dr. Kroeber truly remarks, about their clan affiliations, reticent as they are about all ceremonial matters (notice that about blood kinship they are not reticent either) and why, seeing that a Zuñi will change from fraternity to fraternity and even from *kiwitsine* to *kiwitsine*, and that he may drop out of his priesthood, why does he never change from one clan into another or ever dream of dropping out of the clan he was born into? A Zuñi may be taken at any time of life into a household other than that he was born to, adopting the kinship terms and attitudes proper to his status in the adoptive household, and a Zuñi may go to live in another tribe. How deeply he may feel the effects

of either the tribal or the household transplantation we do not know, but one thing we do know, neither tribal nor household adoption has any effect upon clanship. How does clanship alike in native theory and practice come to be the most *fixed* character of the whole social organization?

ELSIE CLEWS PARSONS

ASIA

The Foote Collection of Indian Prehistoric and Protohistoric Antiquities. Madras Government Museum. Catalogue raisonné. ROBERT BRUCE FOOTE. Government Press: Madras, 1914. 262 pp.

The author of this catalogue, Mr. Foote, who died in 1912 at the age of seventy-eight, was a geologist, who joined the Geological Survey of India in 1858 and retired as senior superintendent of the service thirty-three years later. The greater part of his service was spent in southern India, where he accomplished much in researches of the geology and palaeontology of the country. In 1863 he succeeded in discovering palaeolithic implements near Madras, and thus became the pioneer of prehistoric archaeology in that region and subsequently a recognized authority. His extensive and prolonged journeyings in southern India enabled him to accumulate an extensive collection of objects found chiefly in the Madras Presidency and the neighboring states of Mysore and Hyderabad, also in Baroda and other parts of northern India. The entire collection was purchased by the Madras government in 1904, and a special room was built for its reception in the Art and Ethnological Section of the Madras Museum. The author did not live to see his catalogue out, but had revised most of the proofs. The work, as stated in the preface, has been brought out in two volumes, the second to contain notes on the ages and distribution of the antiquities, plates, map, and index. This second volume has not been sent to me for review or is not yet out. The present first volume (not thus designated on the title-page) contains only a descriptive list of the objects in the collection, arranged according to the districts and localities in which they were found. Altogether 4135 specimens are listed, in addition 68 from Ceylon, 205 beads, and 128 bangles and glass frits, these groups being numbered separately. The descriptions are the briefest possible, only form, material, color, and locality being noted. With the exception of a few cases, no information is given regarding the circumstances of the finds, which would be of especial importance with reference to the glass objects, as the time for the introduction of glass into India has not yet